

You can see the compassion.

"He is flying to these emergencies as soon as he can . . . it shows me that the people who are suffering from these tragedies are in his mind, front and center."

I am pretty sure the millions in Puerto Rico who still lack electricity and running water do not feel that way. They don't feel that way about Trump, and they don't feel that he has any compassion for them. And they definitely aren't "front and center" for this President or his incompetent administration.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Finally, beginning October 17, President Trump repeatedly attacked one of our colleagues, Congresswoman WILSON from Florida, and he essentially said that a Gold Star widow was lying.

Mr. GALLEGGO. So what was Speaker RYAN's response? Actually, we are still waiting to hear from him. He hasn't commented or issued a statement. When Trump repeatedly denigrates the personal integrity of a Member of this body, Speaker RYAN says nothing.

When Trump demeans a grieving widow whose husband has made the ultimate sacrifice for our Nation, Speaker RYAN stays silent. Frankly, it is embarrassing.

Congressman LIEU, what do you think these responses from Speaker RYAN say about the House Republican leadership and the state of the Republican Party?

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative GALLEGGO. There are really only two choices here. Either all of us in Congress can follow the leadership of Republican Senators JOHN MCCAIN, BOB CORKER, and JEFF FLAKE and tell the truth, or we can be complicit.

Senator JEFF FLAKE is unwilling to be complicit. We are unwilling to be complicit.

And keep in mind, when Senator BOB CORKER, who is not a flamethrower, he is the chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and he comes out and says that he is concerned that the President of the United States could lead us to world war III, Americans need to listen.

So we call on Speaker RYAN to not be complicit and enable the reckless and dangerous behavior of our President, and that he have the courage to stand up and tell the truth and to really make sure that our President does not take our country off the rails.

Mr. GALLEGGO. Our Founding Fathers knew that there was danger in putting so much power in one person. They knew that giving too much power to one person, an irresponsible and immature leader, could use that to both effect democracy or enrich themselves.

There is a reason why we have what we call the checks and balances. But one of those checks needs to be the U.S. House of Representatives. Under that, the person who is in charge of the U.S. House of Representatives is Speaker RYAN. He is not providing that

check. He is only helping this administration carry on with their abuse and with the destruction of what we understand are the norms of this democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Members are also reminded to formally yield and reclaim time when under recognition.

□ 1215

ISSUES OF THE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting, when I am watching the news or looking at a newspaper, I can see what kind of pictures are there in the news story, and having been at press conferences where print media that is extremely slanted will come up, the photographer from such media source will come up and get right in front and then start taking pictures and have their camera on nonstop, just click, click, click, second after second. So you know they have got 100, 200 pictures.

It is easy to know what they are doing. They are taking as many pictures as fast as they can. And you know that they are going to go through and they are going to take the picture in which your mouth is in the most contorted position, or where it looks like you are saying a word that would be inappropriate for an elected official to say. You know that is the picture they are going to put up, trying to make you look as stupid as possible before you ever read the article.

For some of us, it is not difficult to make us look stupid. We can't help our looks. But you just know before you ever read the article, when you look at the picture, whether it is going to be a fair and objective article, or whether it is going to be totally skewed and totally subjective.

I notice that, too, sometimes when friends across the aisle come with blown-up pictures. I can look at the pictures and tell whether it is going to be a fair and objective dissertation I am going to hear from my fellow Representatives across the aisle. But it is true of Republicans as well. I just don't see those type of skewed pictures very often at all, if at all, from the Republicans. But, anyway, it seems to be a good rule of thumb. You look at the pictures and you can tell whether it is going to be fair or it is going to be a total hit piece.

I have been very interested, though, to watch during the course of this last 9, 10 months as we come through 2017, the story nonstop from Representa-

tives across the aisle has been about Russia, Russia, Russia. It sounds a bit like Sean Hannity, Russia, Russia, Russia, yes, but I don't mind sounding like somebody I greatly admire.

But isn't it interesting that in the revelations that have been coming out in the last few days, our friends across the aisle have not been as anxious to run down and talk about Russia?

But somebody needs to talk about it. I have been talking about it for quite some time, and for most of this year I have been pointing out that we actually need a special prosecutor, a special counsel to investigate former FBI Director Comey and to investigate the Clinton ties to Russia and the over \$100 million in contributions that came from stakeholders, apparently, of Uranium One. It is just absolutely incredible.

What is amazing, though, there are bound to be so many fingers going out emanating from that deal that we have not seen or heard of. We didn't know what was going on, and now we know that the FBI headed by Director Robert Mueller, at the same time that he was purging the FBI training materials of anything that offended radical Islamists that want to kill us, at the same time he was not investigating properly tips about the older Tsarnaev being radicalized that he was going to kill people. Let's face it, when we get a tip that somebody has been radicalized as an Islamist, it means they are likely going to commit a terrorist act and try to take innocent lives, as Tsarnaev and his brother did.

The FBI didn't properly investigate. They didn't know what to ask. They didn't know how to investigate whether or not somebody had been radicalized because Robert Mueller had purged the training materials so they couldn't know what to ask, how to know if somebody has been radicalized, or they are a peace-loving Muslim, or they are radical Islamist.

Mueller prevented that from happening because he was so taken up with the idea of being friendly and neighborly, he called it his outreach program. He even testified before our Judiciary Committee years ago after I was there about—he kept wanting to make the point that the Muslim community is exactly like every other community. Again, the Muslim community is just like every other community.

He kept making that point over and over as Democrats asked him questions. And then he talked about his lovely outreach program with CAIR—the Council on American-Islamic Relations—that has ties that were named as codefendants supporting terrorism with those who were actually convicted of supporting terrorism.

Yet, even though the FBI had the evidence that convicted these supporting terrorists, and even though there was plenty of evidence that the people who he was trying to be friends with had radical terrorist ties, he continued his so-called outreach program

as people were plotting to kill Americans among those that he was trying to have meals with and be friendly with.

But I asked him the question: You keep saying that the Muslim community here in America is just like every other community, and you keep bragging about your outreach program with the Muslim community. So I would like to ask you, Director Mueller, how was your outreach program going with Jews, Catholics, Baptists, and other religious groups? How is that outreach going? How is your outreach going with the Buddhists and the Confucianists?

Anyway, that was the basic question I asked. Of course, he was taken aback and he couldn't explain because eventually we got the truth. There is no outreach program like that that the FBI had with any other religious group.

So it is kind of disingenuous, if not to say dishonest, to say that a group that requires special attention and coddling is somehow exactly like every other group in America. No, they require special attention, at least that is what Robert Mueller thought.

I don't think any religious group that believes in our Constitution and supports our Constitution requires any such special attention, as Robert Mueller was giving the outreach partner CAIR that has done so much damage to America and continues to undermine evidence to find, arrest, and convict radical Islamists.

It is normally like clockwork. As soon as a radical Islamist has committed a terrorist act, it really is like clockwork. You can count on CAIR—C-A-I-R; not the kind that actually helps people around the world, but CAIR—to be out there with the news conference saying: This guy was not one of us.

But at some point, I hope that people who are Muslims will quit listening to CAIR and will listen to the words of a much wiser individual, President el-Sisi in Egypt, who stood in a room with imams and told them: We have got to get our religion back away from the radicals, or they are going to destroy it.

That is a courageous man, and I don't find that kind of courage among the people who have these press conferences to deflect instead of helping us find and capture the radical Islamists before they kill too many people. They are out there trying to make it appear that they are not really radical Islamists; that they are something else. No, they are radical Islamists. They clearly are.

I was kind of saddened that General Kelly ended up being the chief of staff for President Trump because I thought he was starting out to do a superb job as Secretary of Homeland Security.

It turns out, as some of us had warned, that during the Obama administration, all of this blather about countering violent extremism, CVE, that found its way into legislation that this body passed: Oh, let's don't call it

"fighting radical Islamists." Call it, "countering violent extremism."

Well, some of us had figured out the game, and Michele Bachmann was one of those people. Yes, it is not countering violent extremism. It is fighting radical Islam. Thank God President Trump is now occupying the Oval Office. He understood that ISIS was not just a JV team. They are people who are radical Islamists and they would love to kill as many Americans as possible. They didn't need to have their groups denigrated. They needed to have their groups destroyed.

These were not people who were going to be rehabilitated. They were radical extremists that actually believe with all of their heart that they win a place in paradise by killing innocent people.

If you really want to go back to why there is an English translation copy of the Koran in the Library of Congress that was purchased, owned by Thomas Jefferson, it was because he was negotiating with the radical Islamists, the Barbary pirates in North Africa. He was so well-educated, so well-read, he couldn't understand why the Barbary pirates, who were radical Islamists, kept attacking American ships.

As he indicated: We are not a threat to you. We don't even have a Navy to speak of. We are not your enemy. We don't understand why you keep attacking American ships.

And he was told that, under their belief system, those Islamists believed they went to paradise if they died killing what we would consider innocent people and they consider people worthy of death; they would go to paradise.

Jefferson, as well-read as he was, he couldn't believe that there was any religion anywhere in the world that believed you could go to Heaven or paradise if you are killed while you are killing innocent, unsuspecting people who are not military. They are not a threat to the radical Islamists's life, yet they thought they were going to go to paradise and have 70-some-odd virgins or so waiting for them. He couldn't believe it. So that is when he got his own copy of the Koran, because he just couldn't believe there was a religion that believed you could go to paradise if you are killing innocent people.

Hopefully that will set the record straight with some folks who thought it showed how open-minded Thomas Jefferson was. Actually, he was quite open-minded. Some have tried to denigrate him because he had slaves. The man made plenty of mistakes, and one of them was an egregious wrong he did upon John Adams.

□ 1230

They had been friends for years. It was Adams who asked him to do the first draft of the Declaration of Independence. Jefferson was wise enough that, when he did the first draft of the Declaration of Independence, if you look at the different grievances that he

set out as to why they should be independent from England, the longest paragraph of the grievance was about how King George allowed slavery to ever start in America.

At the time, Virginia had a law making it illegal to free your own slaves, so he was law-abiding. But he believed that one of the worst things that ever happened to America was King George's allowing slavery to start and exist in this country and that it was going to cause massive problems that would be very difficult to cure. He was exactly right on all fronts.

There are some even claiming that George Washington should have his name removed from schools or public places when the fact is there would be no free America without George Washington having lived at the time he did. I believe with all my heart that George Washington was the man for such a time as that. There has never been a man in all of history who led a military in a revolution, won the revolution, and then tendered his resignation, as we see down the Hall, his outreached hand. I think it is the most important scene in all of the Capitol. It is a massive mural. He is handing in his resignation. He sought no further power.

He could have been king of America or an emperor. There were a couple of coups they tried to involve him in. He stopped them. Anybody else in the world we know from history would not have done what he did. He was reluctant to take any power, yet because of his humility and his focus on creating a free and independent land, we have a free and independent land.

Yes, he had slaves, but he was dealing with a Virginia where there was a law against freeing the slaves. But even so, he put in his will that their slaves would be free upon the death of his wife. Certainly, there are better ways to have done that. He was trying to abide by the law.

We have such an incredible history with people like Washington. Some of us were attending an address by an author who had researched and done a biography on Benjamin Franklin, over at the Library of Congress, we were hearing. Someone asked him: Is there anybody you can think of in modern America who reminds you of Ben Franklin? He said: Actually, we have got many people who are witty, clever, and very inventive. Yes, Ben Franklin was an absolutely incredible man.

Of course, I am paraphrasing. But he said: It wasn't like he was George Washington. There was only one of those, just only one of those.

We had the director of The Society of the Cincinnati speak at the Library of Congress on one occasion. He was asked—since most biographers, the more they dig into the background of an individual, and he had studied Washington every year of his adult life—did he come to a point where he had less respect for Washington because of all of the details he discerned about Washington's life.

He indicated that he could honestly say that, in addition to knowing more about Washington every year of his adult life, that he had more respect, admiration, and awe of George Washington with each passing year, with every bit of information he learned. That is the kind of incredible history we have, the kind of selflessness.

People say, oh, yeah, but Washington, look at the big payoff he got. He didn't take a salary, but, boy, did he take a lot of money after the Revolution.

Actually, he didn't take a salary. He didn't take a payoff. He was reimbursed some of his out-of-pocket expenses. He had been paying for spies to work for the country. He had paid so much out of his own pocket, and he was only seeking part of what had come out of pocket knowing that, if the Revolution failed, not only would he have been killed, but, obviously, his family would not have had all that money he spent.

So I think that kind of puts in perspective, when we start looking at people who are willing to sell off America's national security for millions of dollars—well, you have to admire their appreciation for large amounts of money, but not at the price of selling our safety.

So, for all this year, I have been saying that Robert Mueller should never have accepted the role of special counsel because we knew that James Comey was such a close and dear friend of his, and Comey was a witness central to this investigation. He could not be a fair arbiter, a fair investigator. If he had been properly morally inclined, he should have said: I can't be the special counsel because I am too close—especially to Comey—to these people.

Comey, himself, testified that, before he testified up here at Congress, he talked to Mueller. There is a 2013 Washingtonian article that was just a long, glowing piece on Comey that, in effect, if the world were burning down, the one person Comey would know would be right there with him would be Robert Mueller standing with him. These guys were so close. He looked at Mueller as a mentor. They were really tight.

The question in my mind, because of that tightness, since we know Comey leaked in order to, as he said, try to get a special counsel, that Mueller encouraged him to do that: Was Mueller behind this setup to get a special counsel so he could be appointed and start making massive amounts of money and hire all of these Republican-hating Democrats, contributors to Hillary Clinton, some of them?

Wow, what a great setup for a guy who obviously held grudges against some Republicans. This is somebody who should not have been appointed, even though he was appointed to be Director of the FBI by George W. Bush.

Obviously, George W. Bush was trying hard to pick the right people and taking other advice like his father's

mistake in appointing David Souter. Wow, what a disaster that appointment turned out to be. He turned out to be a wolf in sheep's clothing, appearing to act as one thing when we saw his teeth as he went to the Supreme Court.

Edith Jones and David Souter came under consideration. I have been told they were both sitting in the White House as President H.W. Bush tried to figure out which one to appoint. If he had appointed Edith Jones, history would be totally different, and we would not have either Justice Kagan or Justice Sotomayor because whom he appointed would never have resigned during President Obama's Presidency. So those kinds of mistakes have long-reaching effects.

But President Bush appointed Mueller. And the more I find out, unlike the director of The Society of the Cincinnati finding out about Washington and growing in awe and admiration, the more I find out about Robert Mueller, the more concerned I am. The disclosures this week about what this man knew, what this man was involved in, and what he did—I thought he was accepting the role of special counsel because of some possible revenge motive: he had a dislike for some Republicans, loved the idea of doing what Patrick Fitzgerald did, who happened to be not just a friend of James Comey; he was the godfather of a Comey child.

Of course, we found out later that Comey recommended to Attorney General Ashcroft he should recuse himself so that he could appoint the godfather of his child, Patrick Fitzgerald, to be the special counsel. We found out this year, well, Comey leaked information—which may or may not have been a crime; it needs to be investigated—in order to get a special counsel appointed.

So he is using the same type of manipulative behavior as he did to get the godfather of his child appointed special counsel in order to get the one guy who would be with him through thick and thin, no matter how bad things got, Robert Mueller, get him appointed special counsel.

I had no idea that Robert Mueller had been involved and been Director of the FBI as they investigated Russia's efforts to corner the market on uranium and to spend millions and millions of dollars to acquire United States uranium. He is Director of the FBI. They are investigating this.

Even knowing that, it appears that he and now-Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein actually covered up their investigation so that people would not get upset with Secretary Hillary Clinton for being an approver of the deal of selling America's uranium to an enemy of the United States.

According to all the Democrats, for all this year, Russia, Russia, Russia is this big horrible enemy, and how dare anybody do business with them. It turns out that, actually, they were the ones who were involved in this terribly sordid business of selling our national security to the Russians.

The FBI had investigated. They had all of this information, and they even had an FBI informant, as Mueller knew as Director of the FBI. The informant had been working with the Russians. It was an undercover operation, perhaps the most important one the FBI had going on at that time.

They did have the operation going on under Director Mueller of creating a fictitious case against Senator Ted Stevens, Republican from Alaska, in which they created evidence. They conspired to hide evidence that completely didn't just exonerate Ted Stevens; it showed that he was law abiding. They hid that evidence, and they manufactured a case that would cost him his Senate seat.

The loss of his Senate seat ended up putting him on a small plane that crashed, and he lost his life. As far as I know, there were no ties of the plane crash to Mueller, but Mueller was the FBI Director.

Thank God that there was an FBI agent involved in that investigation and that, after Ted Stevens was convicted, he couldn't stand it. His conscience would not allow him to sit quietly by after the FBI and the U.S. Attorney—but this FBI lead agent, under Director Mueller as Director, just fabricated a case.

It turns out not only did Ted Stevens not accept hundreds of thousands of dollars of improvements to his home without paying for them, he paid more, hundreds of thousands more, than the improvements were worth. Apparently, there was even evidence that they covered up where the contractor is saying: Look, Ted, you are paying more than we are charging you.

Stevens would say: Look, I am constantly being watched. People don't like my political positions, so I have got to be so far above and beyond ethical and moral that I have got to pay more. Just accept the checks for overpayment.

The guy is overpaying, and yet they came after him knowing that this was an innocent man. They prosecuted him and convicted him.

So after the whistleblower FBI agent comes forward under Director Mueller's leadership, what happened? The informant was ordered to be kept from investigating any criminal cases, which meant he had no job at the FBI. He went ahead and did as he was being pushed to do.

□ 1245

He went ahead and resigned. Thank God for a man with a conscience like that.

His affidavit made clear that the lead agent had manufactured evidence and hid evidence from the defense counsel, because they had come in with warrants and taken everything: computer drives, thumb drives, documentary evidence, and gone to the bank and gotten his documents. He did not have any evidence to show you how innocent he was, because the FBI had taken it.

I know FBI agents who are the most honest people I have ever met. We have thousands of them in this country. Thank God for them.

But what happened under Director Mueller's leadership?

Well, the whistleblower that exposed the fraudulent misconduct gets run out of the FBI, under Director Mueller.

And what happened to the one who fabricated the evidence, fabricated the case, hid evidence that showed Ted Stevens' innocence?

When Mueller is Director, that FBI agent continued to get accolades and be moved on to investigate some of the most important cases the FBI had. That was Director Mueller.

He also had a policy he created called the 5-year up-or-out policy, which an article in *The Wall Street Journal* pointed out years ago. It ended up destroying or running off thousands and thousands of years of experience from the FBI, weakening this incredible investigative body that, until Mueller got there, was the best investigative body in all of America.

But after running off thousands of thousands of years of experienced FBI agents so that he could have less experienced agents—agents who would not have the experience to say: But, Mr. Director, that would be a mistake, which was done in 1985 or 1992, and it didn't work out—no, he had people with no experience.

I know from being a prosecutor that right out of law school you are ready to put the bad guys away. You are going to push the line to the limit. You are going to do your job, salute the flag, and it always helps to have experienced people around to say: Look, I know you mean well. That is not a good idea.

Mueller liked to run those people off. He spent millions of dollars that some agents pointed out was being wasted on programs that were wasteful and ineffective.

Now that we know what is coming out this week, I am surprised how naive I continue to be. I thought Mueller accepted the job of special counsel to investigate the Russia-Trump alleged relationship because it would be a great job and he could carry out vendettas that he might have. That was so naive.

Now we know that he had an investigation of Russia. He had an undercover informant for years working on the case and that he covered up that investigation, along with Rod Rosenstein, so that Hillary Clinton could make this deal, approve the deal.

And yes, there were other people who approved the deal. I believe that Attorney General Eric Holder also approved the deal and also helped covered up the investigation to show the investigation would show, from all the indications, that Russia was committing crimes in America to get ahold of our uranium.

Knowing that, if that investigation were made public, there is no way Hillary Clinton and Eric Holder could

have approved the deal that was selling off 20, 25 percent of America's uranium to Russia. She could never have done that.

If she hadn't done that, there is not any doubt in some of our minds that the investors, the stockholders, ultimately, of Uranium One certainly would not have contributed over \$100 million to the Clinton Foundation, and Russia would not have been paying half a million dollars for one short speech—remarkably, it is hard to believe from the State of the Union Addresses he gave, but he actually could give a short speech and get half a million dollars for one short speech.

He didn't get paid that much for other speeches. What was so special? Could it be that Hillary Clinton was so critical in persuading others to sign onto allowing Uranium One to get so much of our uranium? Gee, perhaps that is why Russia was so emboldened?

Then we find out there is more than that. The Democratic National Committee, we are told, were helping pay for this dossier that just created the most lurid, ridiculous allegations against Donald Trump as a candidate, trying to destroy his Presidency.

Not only that, the DNC was involved, and the Clinton campaign may have been involved, and the FBI gets involved with that, and it appears they may have used the DNC to pay for manufactured evidence that was absolutely false and that could be used to get the FBI, under Mueller's control and the U.S. Attorney's Office, under Rosenstein's control, to go after the Trump campaign and possibly get wiretaps, based on the DNC Fusion GPS manufactured evidence.

So going back to Mueller accepting the appointment as special counsel and Comey possibly committing a crime the way he went about leaking private information to *The New York Times*, it appears, if you look at his contacts and who reported what from *The New York Times* and what could have only been known by James Comey—it is possible he did it six other times—it is possible James Comey committed crimes in one or all of those six other leaking occasions, if he was the source, as it appears he may very well have been.

Now, it becomes more clear in my naivety in thinking Mueller had personal motivation, including getting paid for a job he would love to do to go after people he didn't like in the Republican Party, including Donald Trump. But now it is becoming more clear. Comey needed Mueller to be a special counsel, and he admitted it in testimony here. He leaked information, which may have been a crime, in order to get a special counsel that he had to have known was going to be Robert Mueller, his friend joined at the hip, and that his other friend, Robert Rosenstein, would certainly appoint Mueller, because Rosenstein and Mueller were involved in covering up the FBI's investigation of Russia and their efforts to get uranium.

If Mueller and Rosenstein hadn't covered up that and helped seal that information and gotten the informant to agree to a nondisclosure agreement, then Hillary Clinton and the Clinton Foundation would be short megamillions that they received as a result—it certainly appears—of the uranium transfer from the U.S. to Russia.

So, Mueller and Rosenstein and Comey all needed Mueller to be appointed, and Mueller needed to accept appointment as special counsel, because he had to cover up the cover-up that he and Rosenstein had been involved in years earlier in order to facilitate the deal that was made to sell off our national security.

President Trump had this great plank in his platform as he ran for President that we need to bring in money that Americans have earned overseas back into the United States. Well, it has never been here, but bring it into the United States.

But these American citizens and American companies have had to leave it in foreign banks and in foreign businesses in foreign countries because, in some countries, they pay 50, 60, 70 percent tax on it. If they bring it into the United States, they will be required to pay probably 40 percent, plus penalty and interest. So 35, 39 percent, plus penalty and interest. They can't afford to do that or they would be paying more tax than the money they earned. So they had to leave it in foreign countries and in foreign banks.

Former FDIC Chairman Isaacs came to the Hill back when this doofus named Henry Paulson was telling us we had to give him \$700 billion so he could buy mortgage-backed securities and save our economy.

In our private conference call—I will never forget—he said: I have got to have \$700 billion to buy these mortgage-backed securities because nobody knows what they are worth and only the government has the wherewithal to buy those. Hold them until they get value back, and that will save all these banks and keep them from going under, which would destroy the United States economy and take us back to a day worse than September of 1929. So you have got to give me \$700 billion to buy these mortgage-backed securities.

When we were allowed to punch in and ask a question, somebody in my party beat me to the question, and it was this: Secretary Paulson, if nobody knows what these mortgage-backed securities are worth, how do you know you need \$700 billion to buy them?

I will never forget his answer: "We just needed a really big number."

When I heard that, I knew that this bozo did not need \$700 billion. We shouldn't have trusted him as Secretary of Treasury. But he got his \$700 billion. Between him and Geithner, they bailed out their friends, they bailed out the big banks while the community banks were being punished. They had to borrow money at regular

rate, and they made sure that their friends, the investment banks that brought us to the brink of ruin, got money for nothing. In fact, they got big bailouts. That was a bad day in American history.

Isaacs had the idea that you don't need to take taxpayer money. If you will just say the United States Congress should pass a bill that says anything we declare to be a troubled company or a troubled asset, if that is invested in by American companies, American individuals who have earned money overseas, never brought it into the country, if they will bring that money from those foreign countries and invest it in what Congress labels as troubled, they will pay no tax on bringing that money into the country. Then we will probably have a trillion dollars come in. You won't need the \$700 billion in taxpayer money or borrowed money from China to bail out the banks. You will have Americans who will invest in those with money they earned overseas. You don't need TARP. It won't be the government getting into bed with the big banks and the terrible precedent that will set. That was a great idea.

But Paulson was so determined to let his enemies like Lehman Brothers go bankrupt without help and to allow his company Goldman Sachs to be the big dog, that he didn't want to do Isaacs' idea, and he convinced enough Members of the House, both Republican and Democrat, to give him \$700 billion, because he needed a really big number.

Well, President Trump had that similar idea: let's allow American money to come into America that is earned overseas, and that will get our economy going. Americans will bring this money in, and it will be great for the economy. That is what we need to get the economy going.

Well, little did we know that, years before, candidate Donald Trump had the idea of bringing in American-earned money from foreign countries to get our economy going. Yet Hillary Clinton had the idea of selling off our national security to get megamillions to go to the Clinton Foundation, her and her husband's bank account, to get the economy going in America.

□ 1300

Wow, that was a great idea, wasn't it?

We sell off some of our national security to bring in foreign money, specifically, Russian money to get our economy going. And if she had been elected President, then the cover up that Mueller and Rosenstein did of the original investigation into Russia's efforts to corruptly buy American uranium and corner the market, that would continue to be covered up.

Wow, what a great deal. Even though Hillary Clinton did not win the election, Donald Trump did. And they got Donald Trump's Attorney General to recuse himself so that Rosenstein, a guy that participated in covering up

the original FBI investigation, could appoint someone else who helped cover up that original uranium investigation with the Russians and make him special counsel so that not only would he make a lot of money and get to work with lots of people he liked that hated Trump and loved Hillary, but he could also cover up the prior coverup, even though Hillary didn't get elected. Amazing the kind of stuff that is coming out now.

The work that John Solomon and The Hill have done has been extraordinary. I have got an article from October 25: "FBI informant in Obama-era Russian nuclear bribery was cleared to testify before Congress."

That is great news. Despite Mueller and Rosenstein's efforts to keep their prior Russian investigation that they covered up so that the Russia uranium deal could go through, wow, we may actually get to find out about that now that the FBI informant has been cleared under the current Justice Department, under Jeff Sessions. We will get to find out more about that Russia effort to corner the market using U.S. uranium.

An article from FOX News: "Gag order lifted: DOJ says informant can speak to Congress on Uranium One, Russia bribery case with Clinton links."

And then I was glad to see a friend down the hall, CHUCK GRASSLEY, a senator there from Iowa. He is calling for special counsel in the Uranium One scandal. Of course, that is appropriate.

The FOX News article: "Clinton mum on Fusion GPS scandal as Dems' dossier denials pile up." That is from October 26.

So now there are indications the Democrat National Committee, a Member actually paid for this fictitious dossier that could be used to get warrants to investigate political opponents in a Presidential race. This is incredible. Absolutely incredible.

Even going back to Tammany Hall, as far as I can recall, they didn't have an FBI Director and an Attorney General or Deputy Attorney General that had helped cover up a prior investigation so that their friends could make millions of dollars.

Let's see. There is an article in The New York Times from Jo Becker and Don Van Natta, Jr. This goes back January 31 of 2008. It indicates: "Late on September 6, 2005, a private plane carrying the Canadian mining financier, Frank Giustra, touched down in Almaty, a ruggedly picturesque city in southeast Kazakhstan. Several hundred miles to the west, a fortune awaited: highly coveted deposits of uranium that could fuel nuclear reactors around the world. And Mr. Giustra was in hot pursuit of an exclusive deal to tap them."

"Unlike more established competitors, Mr. Giustra"—I will just say "Mr. G"—"was a newcomer to uranium mining in Kazakhstan, a former Soviet republic. But what his fledgling company

lacked in experience, it made up for in connections. Accompanying Mr. G on his luxuriously appointed MD-87 jet that day was a former President of the United States, Bill Clinton.

"Upon landing on the first stop of the three-country philanthropic tour, the two men were whisked off to share a sumptuous midnight banquet with Kazakhstan's President . . . whose 19-year stranglehold on the country had all but quashed political dissent."

Another man "walked away from the table with a propaganda coup after Mr. Clinton expressed enthusiastic support for the Kazakh leader's bid to head an international organization that monitors elections and supports democracy. Mr. Clinton's public declaration undercut both American foreign policy and sharp criticism of Kazakhstan's poor human rights record by, among others, Mr. Clinton's wife, Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton of New York."

"Within 2 days, corporate records show that Mr. G also came up with a winner when his company signed preliminary agreements giving it the right to buy into three uranium projects controlled by Kazakhstan's state-owned uranium agency. . . ."

So it is just incredible. The deeper you get in this stuff, the more it smells.

A Wall Street Journal article written by Holman Jenkins, Jr.: "The FBI's Political Meddling." Interesting story. I like the way it starts because it starts referencing a movie, I believe. "Let's give plausible accounts of the known facts, then explain why demands that Robert Mueller recuse himself from the Russia investigation may not be the fanciful partisan grandstanding you imagine."

"Here's a story consistent with what has been reported in the press—how reliably reported is uncertain. Democratic political opponents of Donald Trump financed a British former spook who spread money among contacts in Russia, who, in turn, over drinks, solicited stories from their supposedly 'connected' sources in Moscow. If these people were really connected in any meaningful sense, then they made sure the stories they spun were consistent with the interests of the regime, if not actually scripted by the regime."

"The resulting Trump dossier then became a factor in Obama administration decisions to launch an FBI counterintelligence investigation of the Trump campaign, and after the election to trumpet suspicions of Trump collusion with Russia."

"We know of a second, possibly even more consequential way the FBI was effectively a vehicle for Russian meddling in U.S. politics. Authoritative news reports say FBI Chief James Comey's intervention in the Hillary Clinton email matter was prompted by a Russian intelligence document that his colleagues suspected was a Russian plant."

"Okay, Mr. Mueller was a former close colleague and leader but no

longer part of the FBI when these events occurred. This may or may not make him a questionable person to lead a Russian-meddling investigation in which the FBI's own actions are necessarily a concern.

"But now we come to the Rosatom disclosures last week in The Hill. . . .

"Here's another story as plausible as we can make it based on credible reporting. After the Cold War, in its own interest, the U.S. wanted to build bridges to the Russian nuclear establishment. The Putin government, for national or commercial purposes, agreed and sought to expand its nuclear business in the U.S.

"The purchase and consolidation of certain assets were facilitated by Canadian entrepreneurs who gave large sums to"—drum roll—"the Clinton Foundation, and perhaps arranged a Bill Clinton speech in Moscow for \$500,000. A key transaction had to be approved by Hillary Clinton's State Department."

How about that?

"Now we learn that, before and during these transactions, the FBI had uncovered a bribery and kickback scheme involving Russia's nuclear business, and also received reports of Russian officials seeking to curry favor through donations to the Clinton Foundation.

"This criminal activity was apparently not disclosed to agencies vetting the 2010 transfer of U.S. commercial nuclear assets to Russia."

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I refer to the original FBI and DOJ coverup involving Mr. Rosenstein and Mr. Mueller, which was going to be able to be covered up. That is, so we understand the plot here, Mueller as FBI Director, and Rosenstein working as U.S. Attorney or deputy U.S. Attorney, whatever he was at the time. It is interesting, I hear a rumor that he may have even signed on part of this sealing documents to help cover up the original investigation. It would be interesting to see if he did that. Wow. If it turns out he signed off to get the FBI investigation document sealed, and Mueller, as FBI Director, was charting the course to get this thing sealed, covered up, well, the guys that did the coverup are in charge of the investigation, which would allow them to cover up their prior coverup, which would look bad since they covered it up to allow the Hillary Clinton approved deal selling United States security via our uranium to Russia.

I didn't realize how bad Russia was until my friends across the aisle and Secretary Clinton—candidate Clinton—defeated candidate Clinton kept talking about how bad Russia was. Well, they about convinced me.

But this article says: "The criminal activity was apparently not disclosed to agencies vetting the 2010 transfer of U.S. commercial nuclear assets to Russia. The FBI made no move to break up the scheme until long after the transaction closed. Only 5 years later, the Justice Department, in 2015, disclosed a

plea deal with the Russian perpetrator so quietly that its significance was missed until The Hill reported on the FBI investigation last week."

They almost, if not for the good work of Mr. Solomon and I think somebody else at The Hill, might have been missed entirely. So good work. There are some potential Woodwards and Bernsteins out there, in addition to the hardworking news investigators with places like The Daily Caller and Judicial Watch, Conservative Review, and others.

The article goes on to say: "The agency, when Mr. Mueller headed it, soft-pedaled an investigation highly embarrassing to Mrs. Clinton as well as the Obama Russia reset policy."

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1315

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during Breast Cancer Awareness Month to call attention to this topic that is so important throughout our Nation.

With one in eight U.S. women, or 12 percent, developing breast cancer over the course of their lives, too many of us know someone who has been diagnosed with this tragic disease.

I lost my mother as a result of breast cancer, and my friend and former district director, Jill Cox, was diagnosed with breast cancer in 2015. She attributes her strides in recovery to early detection and self-examinations.

Many women with breast cancer have no symptoms, underscoring the importance of how regular breast cancer screenings and self-examinations can save lives. No test is too early.

We all must continue to work together and move forward addressing breast cancer, and I urge my colleagues to continue their focus on this critical issue.

CODY HILAND APPOINTMENT AS U.S. ATTORNEY

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my good friend Cody Hiland's appointment as the U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

A native of Conway, Arkansas, Cody graduated from the University of Central Arkansas and the William H. Bowen School of Law in Little Rock. He served as the prosecuting attorney for the 20th Judicial District of Arkansas since 2010.

Before beginning his career in law enforcement, Cody was a partner at his own firm, a staff attorney and rural communication liaison for the Arkansas Public Service Commission, and the program director for the Arkansas Transitional Employment Board.

His experience and activism truly embody all that communities need in the fight against crime.

I am proud of this leader and consummate professional. He is devoted to law and order. He will be a great voice in reducing crime throughout central Arkansas.

I congratulate my friend, Cody Hiland.

ARKANSAS ADVOCATES FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES 40TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Arkansas Advocates for Children and Families on the occasion of their 40th anniversary.

AACF was established in 1977 by 10 Arkansans, including our former First Lady, Betty Bumpers, who were passionate about the status of children in our State.

Over the past four decades, AACF has helped families throughout Arkansas to ensure that they have the resources and opportunities to lead healthy and productive lives.

Working to promote good public policy that makes kids' lives better, AACF played an integral role in the creation of ARKids First and the expansion of quality pre-K for at-risk 3- and 4-year-olds.

I would like to extend my congratulations to AACF and wish it much continued success for generations to come.

SPRINGFIELD-DES ARC BRIDGE DEDICATION

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the joint efforts of the city of Conway, Faulkner County, the Faulkner County Historical Society, and Workin' Bridges, a nonprofit organization, that are collaborating to restore a historic bridge in Faulkner County, Arkansas.

The Springfield-Des Arc Bridge, an iron bowstring arc bridge, is the oldest bridge in Arkansas and one of the oldest of its type in the country. The bridge was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1988.

This bridge was originally constructed back in 1874 to facilitate travel between Faulkner and Conway Counties in the Second Congressional District.

Over the years, the bridge faced continued operational wear and tear, three major floods, and lost its flooring to a fire. The bridge was decommissioned when the road was rerouted to a new and better concrete bridge.

Faulkner County Historical Society and the city of Conway worked together to establish a restoration plan for the bridge and proposed to relocate it to Beaverfork Lake Park. The 146-foot structure was dismantled and transported to North Little Rock for cleaning and refinishing. The bridge now sits at Beaverfork Lake Park as a link between the swimming area and the fishing pier.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all those who have worked so diligently over the years to preserve this historic bridge and give it a new use for a new generation.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT ISLAND

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is certainly a historic day, as it is the